

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated February 27, 2004, the Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 12 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,209,026 (Ran et al.). Claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,075 (Kondou et al.). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran et al. in view of Kondou et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,565 (Tyra et al.). Claims 6-11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran et al. in view of Kondou et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316 (De Boor et al.).

By the present response, Applicants have submitted new claims 28-34 for consideration by the Examiner and assert that these claims does not contain any prohibited new matter. Claims 1-28 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner asserts that the limitation "different said information" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this term finds antecedent basis in several places in the claim where the term "the information" is recited. The term "different" further modifies "said information" and, therefore, is the first instance of this term and does not need a preceding

antecedent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 12 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ran et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Ran et al. discloses an Internet utility which receives information about a proposed trip including trip origin, destination and time. The web based utility calculates at least one route and provides periodic automatic updates of information related to the route such as traffic and weather conditions. Other information which may be automatically periodically transmitted includes information about other transportation systems which may interface with a trip such as airline departure or arrival times. Specific information related to a trip or destination such as availability of parking at the destination also constitute the automatically transmitted information.

Regarding claims 1, 12, 20 and new claim 28, Applicants submit that Ran et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, monitoring information from the at least one content provider to determine if any of the at least one portion of the information being displayed on any at least one user terminal has changed, or updating information from the at least one content provider that has changed, or transmitting only the information from the at least one content provider that has changed to the at least one user terminal, the changed information being real-time information, each at least one user terminal capable of determining different said information from different

said at least one content provider simultaneously, or where the transmissions to the user terminal are optimized. The Examiner asserts that Ran et al. discloses monitoring the information from the at least one content provider at col. 12, lines 17-51. However, this portion of Ran et al. merely discloses one of several procedures to receive personalized real-time traveler information and warning that includes starting an Internet software or client software, going to default forms showing personalized real-time travel information on the Internet software or client software, requesting host processing, receiving and displaying the desired personalized abnormal real-time travel condition warning on the Internet software or client software, and where the host processing varies dependent on whether the Internet software server is powerful or conventional. This is not monitoring information from at least one content provider to determine if any of the at least one portion of information being displayed on a user terminal has changed, as recited in the claims of the present application. This portion of Ran et al. discloses starting an Internet software or client software, requesting host processing, and displaying the desired personalized abnormal realtime travel condition warning. These portions of Ran et al. do not disclose or suggest anything related to monitoring information from a content provider, or determining if information displayed on a user terminal has changed. The Ran et al invention relates to simply a software package, specifically, an Internet utility. Moreover, Ran et al. discloses an Internet software server (running the software) sending back processed traveler information based on a update frequency. Ran et al. discloses providing periodic automatic updates of

information (see abstract). In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to monitoring information to determine if information being displayed has changed. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested in these portions of Ran et al.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts the same portion of Ran et al. discloses transmitting only information from the at least one content provider that has changed to the at least one user terminal, as recited in the claims of the present application. However, as has been noted, Ran et al. discloses periodic automatic updates of information. This is not the changed information being real-time information, as recited in the claims of the present application. Moreover, these portions of Ran et al. do not disclose or suggest anything related to transmissions to the user being optimized, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claim 2 and new claims 29-34, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that Ran et al. does not disclose or suggest the information being a plurality of realtime data values from the content provider.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Ran et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 2, 12, 20 and 28 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran et al. in view of Kondou et al. Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of Kondou et al. in Applicants' previously-filed responses. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 12 and 20 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Kondou et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Ran et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the transmitting of the plurality of real-time data values that have been updated in the hash table to the user terminal includes activating a data thread when a real-time data value of the plurality of prior realtime data values is updated in the hash table, or determining the position on the screen in the user terminal corresponding to the realtime data value.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran et al. in view of Kondou et al. and further in view of Tyra et al. (**NOTE**-the Examiner has still ignored Applicants requests and has failed to submit the

Tyra et al. reference on an initialed 1449 form). Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of Tyra et al. in Applicants' previously-filed responses. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this claim is dependent on independent claims 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Kondou et al. and Tyra et al. do not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Ran et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest wherein the data thread is activated using remote method invocation.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 5 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 6-11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ran et al., Kondou et al. and De Boor et al. Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of De Boor et al. in Applicants' previously-filed responses. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 12 and 20 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Kondou et al. and De Boor et al. do not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Ran et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest

monitoring the plurality of keys contained in the user defined portfolio, or identifying currently active keys of said of the plurality of keys.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 6-11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 26 and 27 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-28 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 0171.38083X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600